

THE HONORABLE JAMAL N. WHITEHEAD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

IN RE VALVE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 2:21-cv-00563-JNW

***ELLIOTT* PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO  
INTERVENE FOR LIMITED  
PURPOSE OF OPPOSING MOTION  
TO CONSOLIDATE AND APPOINT  
INTERIM LEAD CLASS COUNSEL**

**NOTE FOR MOTION CALENDAR:**  
November 12, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD FOR INTERVENTION UNDER RULE 24 .....	2
III. ARGUMENT .....	3
A. Intervenors should be permitted to intervene as a matter of right. ....	3
B. Alternatively, permissive intervention by Intervenors is warranted. ....	4
IV. CONCLUSION .....	4

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)**Cases**

<i>Arakaki v. Cayetano</i> , 324 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	2
<i>Blum v. Merrill Lynch Pierce Fenner &amp; Smith Inc.</i> , 712 F.3d 1349 (9th Cir. 2013) .....	2
<i>Bolooki v. Honda Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 2023 WL 2626990 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2023) .....	4
<i>Cnty. of Orange v. Air Cal.</i> , 799 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1986) .....	2
<i>Dep't of Fair Emp't &amp; Housing v. Lucent Techs., Inc.</i> , 642 F.3d 728 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	4
<i>Oakland Bulk &amp; Oversized Terminal, LLC v. City of Oakland</i> , 960 F.3d 603 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	2

**Other Authorities**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24.....	1, 2, 3, 4
-------------------------	------------

## I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Proposed Intervenor John Elliott, Ricardo Camargo, Javier Rovira, and Bradley Smith, the plaintiffs in the related matter of *Elliott v. Valve Corporation*, 2:24-cv-01218-JNW (W.D.Wash.) (the “*Elliott*” action), respectfully request to intervene in the present action for the limited purpose of opposing the pending motion to consolidate and appoint Vorys, Sater, Seymore, and Pease LLP (“Vorys”) as interim consumer class counsel, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a) and (b).

In 2021, a group of game publishers and game consumers filed a class action complaint in this Court, alleging that Valve engages in anticompetitive practices to monopolize personal computer (“PC”) gaming markets. Valve moved to compel arbitration of the consumers’ claims, relying on the arbitration clause in the Steam Subscriber Agreement (“SSA”). This Court granted Valve’s motion, holding that the threshold issue of arbitrability needed to be resolved in arbitration. *See* Dkt. No. 66. As a result, claims brought by game consumers were stayed pending arbitration. *Id.*

After arbitration of the consumer claims was compelled, Vorys was appointed to the executive committee representing *publishers* in this instant case. *See* Dkt. No. 91 at 1 n.1 (“The proposed leadership structure here applies only to the game publisher plaintiffs.”); Dkt. No. 92 (court order). Subsequently, Vorys and the rest of the *Wolfire* leadership elected to drop all consumer claims from their operative pleadings. Dkt. Nos. 99 & 127.

While Vorys has been representing publishers only and litigating this action on their behalf, the named plaintiffs in the current *Elliott* action successfully challenged Valve’s arbitration provision, obtaining a series of arbitrator rulings deeming it unenforceable. These rulings prompted Valve to drop the arbitration provision from its consumer-facing agreements, Dkt. No. 362, making it possible for consumers to challenge Valve’s anticompetitive conduct in federal court. The *Elliott* Plaintiffs’ subsequently brought suit on behalf of a national consumer class against Valve in this Court on August 8, 2024. *Elliott*, Dkt. No. 1.

Despite lacking a case in which consumer claims are asserted, on October 4, 2024, Vorys requested this court to (1) consolidate the *Wolfire* action and *Elliott* action and (2) appoint Vorys

as interim lead class counsel for the consumer class. Consumer plaintiffs in the related *Elliott* action seek to oppose this motion.

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a), intervention by the *Elliott* Plaintiffs should be permitted for the limited purpose of opposing Vorys' motion because, among other things, the Intervenor's interests are not adequately protected by parties in this case, particularly due to the conflict of interest posed by Vorys, who serves as class counsel for publishers in this action. The disposition of Vorys' motion could impair the Intervenor's ability to pursue their case against Valve and secure relief via counsel without any conflict of interest. Alternatively, the Court should permit the requested limited intervention under Rule 24(b), as all elements of Rule 24(b) intervention are satisfied and granting intervention at this early stage, for the limited purpose requested, would not prejudice any parties' rights in *Wolfire*.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD FOR INTERVENTION UNDER RULE 24

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 provides for two methods of intervention: intervention by right and permissive intervention. The requirements of Rule 24 "traditionally receives liberal construction in favor of applicants for intervention." *Arakaki v. Cayetano*, 324 F.3d 1078, 1083 (9th Cir. 2003). Courts are guided primarily by practical and equitable considerations. *Id.*

Under Rule 24(a)(2), a nonparty is entitled to intervene as of matter of right when it "(i) timely moves to intervene; (ii) has a significantly protectable interest related to the subject of the action; (iii) may have that interest impaired by the disposition of the action; and (iv) will not be adequately represented by existing parties." *Oakland Bulk & Oversized Terminal, LLC v. City of Oakland*, 960 F.3d 603, 620 (9th Cir. 2020).

Alternatively, a court may, in its discretion, grant permissive intervention where the applicant "has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact." Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B). Generally, Rule 24(b) allows permissive intervention where the proposed intervenor shows "(1) an independent ground for jurisdiction; (2) a timely motion; and (3) a common question of law and fact between the movant's claim or defense and the main action." *Blum v. Merrill Lynch Pierce Fenner & Smith Inc.*, 712 F.3d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 2013). "Permissive intervention is committed to the broad discretion of the district court." *Cnty. of*

1 *Orange v. Air Cal.*, 799 F.2d 535, 539 (9th Cir. 1986). In exercising its discretion, the court must  
 2 also “consider whether the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the  
 3 original parties’ rights.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3).

4 The requirements under either provision of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 are readily  
 5 met. Intervenor should be permitted to intervene for the limited purpose of opposing Vorys’  
 6 motion to consolidate and appoint Vorys as interim lead class counsel for consumers.

### 7 **III. ARGUMENT**

#### 8 **A. Intervenor should be permitted to intervene as a matter of right.**

9 *First*, intervention is timely. Vorys’ motion to consolidate and appoint as interim lead class  
 10 counsel for the consumer class is still pending in this Court. Dkt. No. 373. Proposed Intervenor  
 11 filed this motion within the time allowed to respond pursuant to local rules. No legally significant  
 12 proceedings have taken place with respect to Vorys’ motion. Dkt. No. 66.

13 *Second*, Intervenor possess a significant, protectable interest in the outcome of Vorys’  
 14 motion to consolidate and be appointed lead counsel. If that motion were to be granted,  
 15 Intervenor’s separately filed action would be consolidated with the *Wolfire* action, and  
 16 Intervenor’s chosen counsel would be displaced by Vorys.

17 *Third*, the Intervenor’s interests will be impaired by the disposition of Vorys’ motion.  
 18 Vorys not only seeks to displace the Intervenor’s choice of counsel, but its request could also  
 19 undermine the interests of the consumer class by having conflicted class counsel represent both  
 20 consumers and game publishers in this case.

21 Finally, Intervenor’s and absent class members’ interests are not adequately protected by  
 22 the existing parties in the *Wolfire* action. There currently is no other consumer case against Valve  
 23 challenging Valve’s anticompetitive conduct. Vorys and the rest of the *Wolfire* leadership chose  
 24 to drop consumers’ claims after arbitration was compelled. Dkts. No. 99 & 127. Vorys, serving as  
 25 the class counsel of game publisher only, has been actively litigating against Valve and has put  
 26 forth a damages model that requires allocating one pool of overcharges between publishers and  
 27 consumers—creating an irreconcilable conflict between publishers and consumers when it comes  
 28 to assessing the anticompetitive effects of Valve’s conduct and measuring damages. The interests

1 of absent class members are not adequately protected in the *Wolfire* action. Accordingly, the Court  
 2 should grant this motion and permit intervention.

3 **B. Alternatively, permissive intervention by Intervenor is warranted.**

4 The district court’s discretion under Rule 24(b) to grant “an application for permissive  
 5 intervention includes discretion to limit intervention to particular issues.” *Dep’t of Fair Emp’t &*  
 6 *Housing v. Lucent Techs., Inc.*, 642 F.3d 728, 741 (9th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Van Hoomissen v.*  
 7 *Xerox Corp.*, 497 F.2d 180, 181 (9th Cir. 1974)). Permissive intervention should be granted where,  
 8 as here, the *Elliott* plaintiffs seek timely intervention for the limited purpose of opposing Vorys’  
 9 motion to consolidate and to be appointed as interim lead counsel for consumers.

10 Intervenor has an independent ground for jurisdiction as they are properly before the  
 11 Court in *Elliott*. Their filing is timely because the motion that Intervenor intend to oppose is still  
 12 pending.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, there are common questions of law and fact between the two actions, not  
 13 limited to the fundamental question presented by Vorys’ motion—i.e., who should represent the  
 14 consumer class. The parties in this action will not suffer any prejudice if intervention is granted,  
 15 and intervention will ensure that the Court hears all viewpoints, including from members of the  
 16 consumer class who oppose Vorys’ application, before determining which counsel should be  
 17 appointed to represent the consumer class.

18 **IV. CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, Intervenor respectfully request limited intervention for the  
 20 purpose of opposing Vorys’ motion for consolidation and appointment as interim consumer class  
 21 counsel.

22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27 <sup>1</sup> See *Bolooki v. Honda Motor Co. Ltd.*, 2023 WL 2626990 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2023)  
 28 (granting permissive intervention for plaintiffs seeking to represent an identical class two weeks  
 after the other plaintiffs moved to be appointed as interim class counsel).

1 DATED: October 21, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

2 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

3 /s/ Steve W. Berman

4 Steve W. Berman (WSBA No. 12536)

5 /s/ Xiaoyi Fan

Xiaoyi Fan (WSBA No. 56703)

6 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000

Seattle, WA 98101

7 Telephone: (206) 623-7292

Facsimile: (206) 623-0594

8 E-mail: [steve@hbsslaw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslaw.com)

E-mail: [kellyf@hbsslaw.com](mailto:kellyf@hbsslaw.com)

9 Ben M. Harrington (*pro hac vice*)

10 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

11 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 300

Berkeley, CA 94710

12 Telephone: (510) 725-3034

Facsimile: (510) 725-3001 fax

13 E-mail: [benh@hbsslaw.com](mailto:benh@hbsslaw.com)

14 William Ward Bucher IV (*pro hac vice* pending)

15 BUCHER LAW PLLC

350 Northern Blvd, Ste. 324 -1519

16 Albany, NY 12204-1000

17 Telephone: (202) 997-3029

Email: [will@bucherlawfirm.com](mailto:will@bucherlawfirm.com)

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*



**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH WORD LIMIT**

I hereby certify that this memorandum contains 1,389 words, excluding the caption, table of contents, table of authorities, signature blocks, and certificate of service, in compliance with the Local Civil Rules.

DATED this 21st day of October, 2024.

/s/ Steve W. Berman  
Steve W. Berman

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 21, 2024, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was filed electronically by CM/ECF, which caused notice to be sent to all counsel of record.

/s/ Steve W. Berman

Steve W. Berman